

CITY OF OAKLAND



CITY HALL • 1311 7th WASHINGTON STREETS • OAKLAND CALIFORNIA 94612

Office of the City Manager  
Cecil S. Riley  
City Manager

November 25, 1974

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

HONORABLE CITY COUNCIL  
Oakland, California

JAN 6 1981

Subject: Community Development UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Mayor and Members of the City Council:

This report is in response to several requests from the City Council within the past week for information and comments, requests which subsume a wide variety of issues and points of interest. In order to provide a common starting point for the discussion, as well as some needed perspective, let us begin with a brief review of the major Council actions of the past few months.

#### BACKGROUND

The first worksession on this subject was scheduled by the Council shortly after the President signed the new Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, on August 22, 1974. The session had two purposes: to provide the Mayor and Members of Council with a briefing on the scope and implications of the new Act, and to decide on an approach to the making of the decisions mandated at the local government level by the new Act. In the latter connection, the Council had the benefit of reports from City staff, the Oakland Redevelopment Agency (ORA) and from other organizations such as the Oakland Citizens' Committee for Urban Renewal (OCCUR). At the conclusion of the worksession, the Council determined

81 01035

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUL 19 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA


that it would be desirable to retain the services of an impartial, objective, outside consultant, to assist the Council in ascertaining both the issues before it and, consistent with the new legislation, to develop the best response by the City of Oakland to those issues. City staff was directed to explore the availability of McManis Associates (especially Mr. Floyd H. Hyde, former Undersecretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)), with the understanding that an expeditious time frame of approximately forty-five to sixty days was to be imposed.

At the Council meeting of September 26, 1974, Mr. Floyd Hyde, Senior Vice President for Urban Affairs of McManis Associates, presented a proposal to assist the City of Oakland in developing a response to the Community Development legislation. In his proposal, Mr. Hyde detailed some thirteen major tasks which the firm proposed to carry out for the City, noting that:

"...the study should go beyond a surface recommendation on organization. It should produce detailed recommendations on the transition of staff from existing organizations and on the policy planning, budgeting, monitoring, and evaluating procedures to be employed. It should describe the relationship of these procedures to ongoing city management practices."

Mr. Hyde projected that twenty weeks would be required for completion of the schedule (September 27, 1974 through February 14, 1975), and planned on submitting preliminary findings and recommendations to the Council by November 26, 1974, so that the necessary initial decisions could be made by the Council prior to the





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C123307668>

accomplishment of the detailed planning outlined by the consultant in his Tasks 8 through 10, in time for the full assignment to be completed on schedule.

The Council approved the McManis Associates proposal, and directed City staff to move immediately to complete the necessary arrangements. In addition, the Council authorized City staff to initiate the process of the preparation of the initial grant application.

During the month of October, work proceeded on schedule. The consultant conducted numerous interviews and collected a substantial amount of background information and written documentation from City departments and agencies, as well as from community organizations, which he required to accomplish his preliminary analysis. In addition, I assigned the Deputy City Manager to direct the preliminary staff efforts with regard to the first grant application. The nucleus of a staff task force was established, and a considerable amount of preparatory work was accomplished, including extensive interchange with officials of the HUD Area Office.

On October 30, 1974, the consultant advised the Council that the firm's preliminary findings and attendant recommendations would be presented to the Council on November 12, 1974, two weeks ahead of the November 26 target date. The reason for the expedited schedule was to allow additional time for the Council to assess the recommendations, time that was made possible because of the consultant's decision to omit the customary practice of advance discussion of the preliminary findings and recommendations with involved staff, in order to preserve





the appearance, as well as the reality, of the total objectivity of the consultant.

On Tuesday night, November 12, 1974, Mr. Hyde presented his preliminary findings and recommendations to the City Council and the Oakland community, "for consideration, discussion, and action by the Oakland City Council." Although some errors of fact and emphasis have been noted in the report, they are a natural consequence of the consciously-adopted methodology of avoiding advance review by all directly involved officials, in the interest of preserving the overall objectivity of the report. Because of the risk of errors, the consultant took pains to label the findings "preliminary." As one of the officials involved, and as a professional City Manager, I must say frankly, that I am delighted that the consultant took the course that he did - for the result has to be exactly the objectivity that the Council called for originally, in the knowledge that citizens of Oakland would be the ultimate beneficiaries.

Following this initial presentation, the Council set a worksession for November 19, 1974, in order to discuss the report further and to hear from representatives of organizations in our community, as well as from interested citizens. In order to provide a focal point for the Council discussions, Mayor Reading outlined one approach to the organizational structure, in order to conceptualize the final recommendation of the consultant. Consistent with the approach outlined originally by the consultant at the time of his retention by the Council, and subsequently in the submission of his November 12 report, the Mayor's focus was on the basic decision before the Council - whether the administrative responsibility would remain with the existing general purpose local government, or whether it





would be delegated to an administratively autonomous entity.

At the conclusion of the November 19 meeting, the Council reached several decisions. First, the Council declined to approve the seven recommendations of the consultant, en bloc, recognizing the need for additional input and discussion (indeed, this was as anticipated by Mr. Hyde when he moved his report date up to November 12 from November 26). Second, the Council approved the one recommendation of the consultant on which staff had stressed the urgency of a decision, in order that the grant application process might proceed. That recommendation provided as follows:

"In order to provide immediate involvement of citizens in the preparation of an application for Community Development funding, we recommend that the Council designate OCCUR as the facilitator of a citizen participation process that conforms to the spirit of the Act."

In approving this recommendation, the Council requested a report from OCCUR regarding the process which it envisioned in order to carry out the purposes of the Act with regard to citizen participation, and with regard to the deficiencies noted by the consultant. In addition, the Council requested comments from City staff regarding the process to be carried out by OCCUR, the manner in which the deficiencies would be addressed, the procedures which would be used to monitor and evaluate the citizen participation process, and finally, a description of the manner in which the citizen participation process would be related to the preparation of the grant application, including an outline of the timetable which would



be followed in the preparation of the grant application.

In its final actions at the November 19 worksession, the Council reaffirmed its previous assignment of responsibility to the City Manager to prepare the grant application, but declined to act on the consultant's recommendation that, "City staff ... be given full and clear authority and responsibility for the carrying out of the City's program pursuant to the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974," in order to allow for additional input and discussion at another worksession, which was scheduled for Tuesday, November 26, 1974.

Consistent with this latter decision, the Council at its meeting of November 21, 1974 requested that City staff, ORA, and the Oakland Housing Authority (OHA) prepare comments for consideration by the Council at the worksession of November 26 regarding the recommendations contained in the Hyde Report, as well as regarding the proposal outlined by the Mayor at the previous worksession of the Council.

The above recapitulation of the events and process of the past several months serves to provide some perspective that can be helpful in maintaining a clear sense of purpose in our evolving response to the community development legislation. What remains is to coordinate the actions taken by the Council regarding the first year grant application process and the recommendations of the Hyde Report, and to firm up the growing sense of direction.

To this end, let me respond to the Council's request for information and feedback regarding the grant application process, since that is the first order of business, beginning with a brief exposition of some additional basic information





about community development, followed by comments addressed to questions which were raised in the Council worksession of November 19, including a description of the staff effort which is presently in progress, the timetable which is before us, and the role of OCCUR as the facilitator of the citizen participation effort. Following that discussion, I will have several comments and observations to offer regarding the recommendations of the consultant which are still pending.





FEDERAL GRANT APPLICATION

There are three major items of additional information regarding the first year grant application of which Council should be informed: the entitlement projections, the components of the formal grant application, and the advance of first year funds which is available.

## 1. Schedule of Entitlements:

Though subject to a final rechecking by HUD, the following table shows the amount of money to which Oakland is entitled under provisions of the Act for the next six years, as provided by HUD.

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>\$(millions)</u>
1974-75	12.504
1975-76	12.504
1976-77	11.890
1977-78	9.716
1978-79	8.087
1979-80	7.004

## 2. Components of the Application:

Although not yet officially available, it appears from information provided to the City by Mr. Floyd Hyde and others that the application will consist of four parts, as follows:

- Part I.           Application for Federal Assistance (a one-page standard Federal form)
- Part II.          Narrative Summary.



A. This portion will contain a summary description of the City's housing and community development needs, priorities, and programs, including goals and objectives for the program year.

Part III. Budget and Financial Data related to programs described under Part II above.

Part I . Assurances - or Certifications

A. Compliance with specified Civil Rights and Equal Opportunity legislation, executive orders, and other HUD regulations.

B. Compliance with the Citizen Participation provisions of the Act.

C. Compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970.

D. Assumption of responsibilities as specified under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

E. Compliance with Federal Standards for Financial Management Systems.

F. Compliance with objectives of the Act by giving "maximum feasible priority" to activities either benefiting low and moderate income persons, or aiding in the prevention or elimination of blight.

3. Ten Percent Advance of Funds:

For the first year only, the City may request an advance of funds not to exceed ten percent of its entitlement (i. e., \$1,250,400).

Advance Funds may be used:





(a) To plan and prepare for the implementation of CD activities (interpreted by HUD staff to mean tasks related to and necessary for the preparation of the application); and

(b) To continue previously approved Urban Renewal and Model Cities activities.

While the advance funds can be used commencing January 1, 1975, HUD approval of a not-yet-published form, to be submitted by the City, is first required. As further information on the procedure for obtaining the advance is made available, Council will be advised.

Several actions at the staff level have been taken to facilitate the first year grant application which should be summarized. A two-tiered staff effort has been established. First, an inter-departmental working task force was created to perform the detailed staff work in preparing the application; while small at the outset, it has been augmented with additional staff, drawn from all involved departments and agencies. Second, a Technical Advisory Committee, composed of the heads of City departments and agencies whose functions are directly related to community development has been created. The purpose of the committee is to facilitate the efforts of the task force by focusing top executive attention on community development in a coordinated and concerted manner. Both of these efforts are under the direction of the Deputy City Manager.

Up to this point, the task force has concentrated on becoming totally familiar with the Housing and Community Development Act along with the





rules and regulations issued by HUD. Many questions have been raised and-- through continuous contact with HUD--some have been answered. The task force has also started the process of obtaining programmatic ideas and inputs for the first-year grant application. It has assembled the necessary information to be provided to citizens, as required by the Act; compiled and submitted to HUD a list of all documents referred to in the regulations (which HUD is in the process of assembling for the City) and contacted and received information from ABAG concerning the A-95 process as it will specifically relate to Community Development applications. In addition, information regarding the status of existing projects and programs is being assembled, in coordinated fashion for the first time, as the essential basis for further programmatic planning.

The Staff efforts outlined above have not only built upon, but have stressed throughout, the cooperative involvement of staff from all departments and agencies whose activities are related to or should be related to the City Community Development effort. Staff is involved from all of the following organizations: Oakland Redevelopment Agency, Oakland Housing Authority, Building and Housing Department, City Planning Department, Department of Manpower Development Programs, Model Cities Department, Department of Community Resources, and the Offices of Public Works, Budget and Management Services, and Parks and Recreation. That an effort of this magnitude and spirit could be mounted in the face of the organizational uncertainty which has been so pervasive (and on which I will comment further below) is a most hopeful sign.



The Time Schedule. Before embarking on a discussion of the citizen participation effort which will be conducted by OCCUR, in cooperation with City staff, it is appropriate to discuss the time frame within which the first year grant application process proceeds. In this connection, reference is made to the schedule, which is attached at the conclusion of this report.

The schedule envisions a two-pronged, inter-related effort, commencing immediately and running through January 21, 1975. On the one hand, OCCUR will be facilitating a wide-ranging effort to disseminate information to citizens and to obtain their suggestions and input about the City's programmatic response to the new legislation. This effort will be conducted with the full cooperation of City staff, including all involved departments and agencies. Simultaneously, the staff effort outlined above will proceed, developing the details of programs which can or should be included in the first year community development effort. It is assumed that input from citizens will be injected into staff's planning and program development effort through continuing liaison with staff of OCCUR. Similarly, as program ideas are developed and fleshed out by staff, information about them will be made available through the same liaison mechanism to the citizens who are participating in the process being facilitated by OCCUR. Additionally, further direct communication between participating citizens and staff will take place in discussion at the community meetings to be scheduled by OCCUR.

It is thus envisioned that these two efforts will dovetail into presentations to the Council in a work session on January 21, 1975, with City staff





outlining the program alternatives which have been developed and OCCUR representatives presenting citizen views to the Council for consideration. Although only one additional Council work session is explicitly planned in the schedule, it should be noted that Council may wish to schedule additional meetings as necessary during the January 21-30 time frame to review and decide upon program alternatives. The January 30 date must, however, be adhered to in order to allow adequate time for the preparation of the draft grant application itself, and for advance distribution prior to Council consideration on February 18, 1975.

The schedule next projects a final Council decision approving the grant application on Tuesday, February 25, 1975. It is assumed that Council would hold a public hearing at the Council meeting, prior to final consideration of a resolution approving the grant application. The February 25 date should also be considered as a firm one, in order to provide for submission of the application to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) not later than March 1, 1975. Since the HUD regulations mandate a 45-day review process prior to submission to HUD, and since the final date for submission to HUD is April 15, 1975, the March 1, 1975 deadline for submission to ABAG for the A-95 review process is a must.

As has been noted, the final date for submission of the approved grant application to HUD is April 15, 1975. HUD is required to take action on the application within seventy-five (75) days of submission. Thus, if HUD takes the full seventy-five day period for review, approval of the application, and the formal



commencement of implementation, would be as of July 1, 1975.

There are a number of observations which could be made regarding the process outlined above. First, maximum opportunity for citizen participation has been built into the schedule. While Council may wish to have additional time than that provided in the schedule for its review, such a change would necessarily further constrain the opportunity for direct citizen involvement, using the OCCUR mechanism. Similarly, while OCCUR may desire additional time for citizen participation, such a change would constrain even more severely the limited time provided for Council review and decision-making.

Second, and most important, an understanding of the schedule which has been outlined serves to emphasize--in full force--the fact that the process of developing the City's application for funds under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act will necessarily be an abbreviated one the first time around. While the backup material such as the community development plan and the housing assistance plan will be developed by staff, the focus in the preparation of the first application must be a programmatic one, although within this context maximum efforts must be made to articulate the needs which are addressed by the programs proposed for funding. The essential difference is that the complex process envisioned by the Act of needs identification, goal determination, and program development will necessarily be short-circuited this first time around. That this will be the case is clearly recognized by HUD and its officials; indeed, the Act itself recognizes this reality by providing for the use of community development



funds for the development of the comprehensive development plan during the first year.

Having outlined the first year grant application process, it is appropriate to comment further on the involvement of OCCUR, as the facilitator of citizen participation in accordance with the consultant's recommendation which was adopted by the Council on November 19, in response to the several questions raised at that Council work session.

Several preliminary discussions have been held between City staff and OCCUR staff over the past several weeks. It is my understanding that a report to the Council is being prepared by OCCUR regarding the process which OCCUR would plan to undertake in response to the adoption of the consultant's recommendation. Given the discussions in which we have participated, I expect that the process developed by OCCUR will be generally compatible with the planning which City staff has accomplished, as reflected in this report, and I am certain that the OCCUR process will be responsive to the citizen participation requirements of the legislation.

In view of the above comments, I assume and hope that Council will be in a position to approve, conceptually, the OCCUR proposed plan of action. Following such approval, City staff will work with OCCUR to develop a written work program in an appropriate form. That program must be consonant with the schedule outlined above and with the general approach approved by Council. The agreement to be developed between the City and OCCUR, in addition to containing





the defined work program in terms of tasks to be accomplished, should identify the goals and objectives to be achieved by OCCUR as a part of its efforts to facilitate citizen participation in connection with this first grant application.

Also, such an agreement would normally provide for regular reporting by OCCUR to the City of its progress in realizing the stated objectives, as a prerequisite to effective monitoring and evaluation, although such reporting requirements should be limited in nature in this first effort, realistically recognizing the compressed time frame.

Thus, through the development of a detailed agreement between the City and OCCUR, which will be submitted to the Council for final approval as a regular agenda item, the basis will be clearly established for monitoring performance during the first grant application process, as well as for evaluating overall success in the achievement of stated goals and objectives toward the conclusion of the process. This entire approach, by the way, is nothing new as in the relationship between the City and OCCUR. Indeed, much the same process was followed in the development of the current agreement with OCCUR two years ago; this new dimension in the current effort is the immediacy of the task at hand.

Two additional points should be made in response to Council direction with regard to the relationship with OCCUR. First, explicit mention was made of deficiencies in the representativeness within OCCUR. I understand that OCCUR is addressing itself to that criticism in its report to you; suffice it to say, however, that it is possible to include standards of representativeness in the agreement to



be worked out, toward which OCCUR can and should be making good faith efforts in the course of its work. In view of the constraints under which a volunteer organization such as OCCUR operates, nonetheless, it would probably be unreasonable to try to establish fixed standards of representativeness.

Secondly, OCCUR will require additional budgetary support in order to provide the contemplated services to the City. It may be possible for some of that support to be in the form of in-kind services (e.g., printing, duplicating), but additional direct financial support will probably be required. While this matter should be worked out in the finalization of the agreement, it should be noted at this point that a long-term or on-going financial commitment should not be made by the Council pending its final decision regarding the Citizen Participation Plan which is to be adopted by the City. That decision should be made at the time that the grant application is finalized, when overall funding decisions are made by the Council. By that time, Council will have the benefit of the consultant's detailed recommendations, which will cover citizen participation, including the role of an organization such as OCCUR and the role, if any, of an Advisory Commission, as well as the benefit of the evaluative reports of OCCUR's performance during the first year grant application process.

In summary, it is recommended that Council approve the basic conceptual approach outlined by OCCUR, and direct City staff to develop, in consultation with OCCUR, the written agreement outlined above, in appropriate form for submission to the Council for final approval. If Council takes this action, work can proceed immediately and will not be held up until the details of the agreement are finalized.





THE HYDE REPORT

I should like now to turn to the recommendations set forth in the report submitted to the Council on November 12, 1974, by Mr. Floyd H. Hyde of McManis Associates, and to the organizational response outlined by Mayor Reading at the Council worksession of November 19, 1974, with comments and observations as requested by Council at its meeting of last Thursday.

As I expressed to the Council during its discussion of the motion soliciting this report, I welcome the opportunity to comment regarding the recommendations contained in the Hyde Report and regarding the proposal outlined by the Mayor. As I commented at the outset of this report, I am confident that the public interest was well served by the report that McManis Associates submitted to the Council on November 12, especially in terms of the major insights it reflected and its uncompromising objectivity.

As I have also expressed to the Council, and as Mr. Hyde took pains to point out, the findings contained in the report were preliminary in nature. In some cases, they reflected (in my opinion) overstatements or inappropriate emphasis; in other instances, errors of fact appear.

Because the findings in the report were preliminary, however, it is inappropriate that they receive further comment in this report. Let me therefore focus on the recommendations, in order of presentation. An extract of the recommendations is attached for ready reference at the conclusion of this report, keyed to the comments which follow.



Recommendation 1: Attach high priority to translation of goals and policies into objectives. No professional manager can disagree with the approach of this recommendation; indeed, it is based on principles of clarity and precision which are the essence of effective management. This is a recommendation which Council should adopt without delay, bearing in mind one important qualification: staff is currently consumed by a number of "high" priority assignments. While it is important that the principle contained in this recommendation be adopted, it must be recognized that the staff work required for complete implementation must be integrated as time permits with the existing workload.

Recommendation 2: Define standards for evaluation of City staff performance with regard to citizen participation policies; establish training efforts to sensitize City staff to issues of citizen participation.

The thrust of the second part of this recommendation is clear, and responsive to an obvious need. I have already asked the Personnel Director to develop a training program which is directed to this area of concern. The first part of the recommendation, however, is not clearly defined and requires further clarification from the consultant. As set forth in the report, it would appear that it would be satisfied if the consultant's first recommendation were to be carried out.

Recommendation 3: Designate OCCUR as facilitator of citizen participation. This recommendation has already been approved by Council, and is addressed at length above.

Recommendation 4: Council adopt a policy of more direct involvement in



and support of "social-oriented programs." This may be one area where the fact-finding did not get to the depth required to provide for an accurate appraisal of the reasons for the Council's apparent position. In fact, the consultant took care to note his own observation that each member of Council personally supports such involvement. It would seem that this recommendation is closely related to recommendation 7, below; for if that recommendation is approved, Council will have the closest possible relationship to such programs since they would be integrated into the fabric of the administrative structure which is directly responsible to the Council.

Recommendation 5: Establish a central project planning staff. City staff supports the basic concept embodied in this recommendation--the establishment of a centralized capacity to accomplish program planning. At the present time, no such capacity exists centrally, having been decentralized within each program or department. The opportunity for implementing creative change as a result of the Housing and Community Development Act is best exemplified in the area of program planning.

I do have one additional observation, however, with regard to this recommendation. Unquestionably, the consultant included this item in his initial set of recommendations because of the centrality of the concept to the spirit of the new legislation. Nonetheless, this particular recommendation is, in my opinion, premature if Council were to go beyond the precise language of the recommendation, as stated. In short, the concept is obvious and appropriate; details of implementa-





tion of this recommendation should be developed as part of implementation of any change to the total organizational structure and staffing patterns.

Recommendation 6: Establish central capacity for program monitoring and evaluation. The comments which I expressed above with regard to recommendation 5 are equally pertinent with regard to this recommendation, in all respects.

Recommendation 7: Assign responsibility for execution of community development programs to City staff. A comment previously submitted in a staff report to the Council continues to be relevant:

"The responsibility for the implementation and administration of the programs called for under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 must be accepted as an important institutional obligation of this City government--legislative and executive. Once this has been done, the administrative structure should be carefully, objectively, and professionally examined to determine the changes that may be required to achieve optimum results."

This continues to be the position of City staff--consistent with the final recommendation of the consultant, as stated in the report. Emphasis must, however, be placed on one important principle, which seems to be overlooked as the focus is placed on the preparation of organizational charts: Council must decide on an overall course of action prior to the development of the details of the organizational structure. The time has come to quit putting the proverbial cart



before the horse. The planning which must go into a detailed plan of organization, including its structure, its staffing pattern, its processes, and the method of transition into it, is extraordinarily complex: it must be accomplished carefully and thoughtfully with considerable input from all of the managers responsible for its subsequent operation, consistent with the program objectives of the Council.

These comments, I believe, are entirely consistent with the approaches taken by your consultant and by Mayor Reading, both of which were focused on the basic question of the assignment of administrative responsibility for program management, reserving the details for subsequent definition. As your consultant has indicated on several occasions, including his initial proposal, the Council must first determine that basic direction in which it wishes to proceed; having made that determination, the consultant would then work with involved management to accomplish the detailed planning which could be brought back to Council for final approval.

The approach taken by the Mayor was precisely the same, although one not experienced in management might have been confused by what was proposed in the organization chart which was presented. Technically, the proposed chart was a precise depiction of line management responsibilities and the flow of authority from the electorate, through the Council to the City Manager. Below that level, however, the chart as presented was what is called a functional organizational chart, i. e., it did not depict the details of the assignment of line management responsibility through the use of job titles; rather, it used terms describing the functions to be





addressed by the organizational structure that remained to be defined. Thus, the term "Community Development" was used, rather than a term such as "Director of Community Development."

Beyond this essential principle, I would offer two additional observations, both of which I have articulated on previous occasions. First, it is imperative that all of us--Council, involved staff of City departments and agencies, and citizens of Oakland--recognize that the "new" community development effort in this City is not being invented out of whole cloth; indeed, quite the reverse is true. Common sense mandates that the "new" program be built upon the foundations of existing and past programs and projects which were funded with categorical funds. We are not starting an entirely new book, we are starting a new chapter in an existing one, by reshaping existing service delivery tools in a more coordinated and integrated manner.

An important and logical corollary of this notion is that the service delivery system which is our focus is operated by skilled human beings, professionals, who are committed to the effort to improve the quality of life for all of the citizens of this community. Any organization will be built on and must utilize to the fullest all of the quality and talent presently serving the community under the existing structure.

Second, it is an extreme understatement to observe that uncertainty abounds at the staff level. Uncertainty as to the affect of all of this change, or potential change, on the organization, on the programs and services presently being pro-



vided, and, more importantly than all the other factors, on the personal future of the members of the organizational components. Frankly, signs of the debilitating effects that this uncertainty engenders are already appearing--resulting in reduced effectiveness to a serious degree. Although this problem can not be resolved immediately, affirmative action by Council on recommendation 7 would at least make it possible for the detailed planning regarding new staffing patterns to actively commence and would, in my opinion, substantially ameliorate the concerns which have impaired our on-going efforts. As I indicated to you in your last meeting, the structure of an organization is delicate because it is built upon the most valuable resource available--human beings.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this report I have tried to draw together a number of disparate but interrelated concerns elaborating in the process on the course we have traveled together over the past few months, in the hope that we might draw a renewed sense of purpose and immediate direction. Let me summarize with regard to the three key items which have been covered: the grant application process, the role of OCCUR, and the City response to the consultant's recommendations.

I have in this report provided information regarding the first year grant application and the status of staff's current efforts, and have outlined the course of action and its attendant timetable. If the schedule and approach are followed,



based on a continuation of the existing cooperative spirit, I am confident that the deadline will be met and the community development program begun in a timely manner.

As I suggested in the discussion of the role of OCCUR, it is important that the citizen participation process begin immediately, with the commencement of detailed programmatic planning for community development, so that citizens will have the opportunity for input and involvement from the outset. The green light for the role projected by the consultant for OCCUR should be reaffirmed, and staff directed to develop with OCCUR the details of the work program to be followed, as well as other aspects of the agreement enumerated in this report.

Finally, the Council should act immediately upon at least the final recommendation of the consultant's report, so that the detailed planning can commence. While it is premature at this juncture to say with certainty, it may be possible to segment some of this work, thus allowing for progress reports to Council as we proceed, should the Council so wish. In any event, it is vital that the uncertainty which is presently so pervasive and constraining be ameliorated by the adoption of a basic course of action.

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 unquestionably presents fantastic new opportunities for innovation, and for the improvement of present service delivery systems, which are the tools by which a City government attacks the problems which beset its citizens. Equally as important, the new





Honorable City Council

- 26 -

November 25, 1974

legislation should, if properly implemented, substantially increase the ability of the existing general purpose local government to respond to community problems; it must also be the catalyst for vastly improving its ability to respond.

Respectfully submitted,

  
CECIL S. RILEY



GRANT APPLICATION SCHEDULE

Council approval of schedule and approach	Nov 26
Conduct community meetings (OCCUR)	Thru Jan 21
Develop program alternatives (Staff)	Thru Jan 21
Presentation to Council (Staff and OCCUR)	Jan 21
Further Council discussion; basic program decisions	Jan 30
Presentation of draft grant application to Council (Staff)	Feb 18
- Finalize for advance distribution by Feb 13	
Council final decision on grant application	Feb 25
Submit application to ABAG; Start of 45-day A-95 review period	Mar 1 *
Submit application to HUL; Start 75-day review period	Apr 15 *
HUL Approval - Commence formal program implementation	Jul 1 *

\*

Final date under HUL regulations



## Consultant Recommendations

### Must Items

3. In order to provide immediate involvement of citizens in the preparation of an application for Community Development funding, we recommend that the Council designate OCCUR as the facilitator of a Citizen participation process that conforms to the spirit of the Act.
7. City staff should be given full and clear authority and responsibility for the carrying out of the City's program pursuant to the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

### Possible Items

1. The City Council should establish as a matter of high priority, the translation of the goals and policies of Oakland into measurable, achievable objectives.
2. The City Council should, as an integral part of its Policy Plan and goal for improved citizen participation (Res. 51836) initiate actions that would (a) evaluate city performance against these stated policies, and (b) develop training for city staff that would lead to a greater understanding of and sensitivity to the issues of citizen participation.
4. The Oakland City Council should clearly and unequivocally adopt a policy of more direct involvement in and support of social-oriented programs, whether they be funded locally or by State or Federal resources.

### Not Pressing Items

5. There should be established in city government, a central project planning staff which would have the responsibility for identifying needed project activity, establishing performance milestones and assigning of responsibilities.
6. A city-wide capacity for program monitoring and evaluation should be established as an integral part of the Community Development effort.



U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C123307668

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUL 19 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA